



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,157	06/19/2003	Madhavi W. Chandra	CISCP326/6804	5810
22434	7590	10/06/2008	EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER LLP P.O. BOX 70250 OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250				PATEL, CHIRAG R
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2441				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/06/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/600,157	CHANDRA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	CHIRAG R. PATEL	2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3,5-10,12-27,29-37 and 39-48 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-3, 5-10, 12-27,29-37 and 39-48 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see pages 13-20, filed July 14, 2008 with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-48 under 35 USC 102 and 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Madour (US 2002/0021681).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-16, 21-27, 29, 31-37, 39, and 42-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madour et al. – hereinafter Madour1 (US 6,970,693) in view of Madour et al. – hereinafter Madour2 (US 2002/0021681) / Grabelsky (US 2004/0003046).

As per claims 1 and 42-44, Madour1 discloses in a PDSN, a method of releasing resources, comprising:

sending an access request message to a first AAA server for authentication of a node; (Col 2 lines 20-31; Col 5 line 62 – Col 6 line 24)

receiving an access accept message from the first AAA server; (Col 6 lines 25-61; Fig. 4)

establishing a Mobile IP session as a Foreign Agent for the node when an access accept message is received from the first AAA server; (Col 6 lines 25-61)

storing information associated with the node in resources associated with the PDSN; (Col 4 lines 17-30)

receiving a disconnect request message; and (Fig 5: item 526)

Madour1 fails to disclose releasing the resources when the disconnect request message is received , wherein the resources comprise memory and the information comprises PPP information associated with a PPP session. Madour2 discloses releasing the resources when the disconnect message is received. Grabelsky discloses wherein the resources comprise memory and the information comprises PPP information associated with a PPP session. ([0092])

In reference to KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. -, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007), it would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine prior art elements to releasing the resources when the disconnect message to received and implement PPP in the disclosure of Madour1 in use as a protocol in Mobile IP as it is well known to use of typical wireless infrastructure components and to prevent unnecessary use of resources (Madour2 [0048]) Madour1 discloses per Col 5 line 65 – Col 6 line 24,” Shown in FIG. 4 is a serving PDSN 400 that serves a prepaid user's mobile station (not shown), a Home Agent (HA) 402 of the prepaid user, and an HAAA/PPS server 200 as described hereinbefore (note that the

HAAA/PPS may alternatively be an HAAA server). The serving PDSN 400 receives a Mobile IP (MIP) Registration Request (RRQ) 406 from a prepaid user". Grabelsky et al. discloses per [0092], "In FIG. 9, PPP connections 902 and 908 from the mobile terminals 936 and 938 terminate at packet data serving nodes (PDSN) 904 and 906. In 3G networks, mobile IP may be used to provide user terminal mobility while maintaining an always on IP connection to a network 918 such as an IP network."

As per claim 2, Madour1 disclose the method as recited in claim 1 wherein the disconnect request message is received from the first AAA server. (Fig. 5: item 526)

As per claim 3, Madour1 disclose the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the disconnect request message is received from a second AAA server via the first AAA server. (Col 1 lines 31-61)

As per claim 5, Madour1 disclose the method as recited in claim 1, discloses wherein the resources comprise memory and the information is associated with the Mobile IP session. (Col 5 line 62 – Col 6 line 24)

As per claim 6, Madour1 discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the disconnect request message is received from the first AAA server. (Col 3 line 63 – Col 4 line 4)

As per claim 7, Madour1 discloses the method as recited in claim 3, wherein the first AAA server is a visited AAA server associated with a foreign network and the second AAA server is a home AAA server associated with a home network of the node. (Col 1 lines 31-61; Figure 1)

As per claims 8 and 36, Madour1 discloses the method as recited in claim 3, wherein the first AAA server is a visited AAA server associated with a foreign network and the second AAA server is the visited AAA server associated with the foreign network. (Col 1 lines 31-61)

As per claim 9, Madour1 discloses the method as recited in claim 3, wherein the access request message and access reply message are RADIUS messages, and the first and second AAA servers are RADIUS servers. (Col 1 line 60 – Col 2 line 9)

As per claims 10, 27, and 37, Madour1 discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the disconnect request message comprises a source PDSN identifier identifying the PDSN, a username identifier identifying a user associated with the Mobile IP session, and a session identifier identifying a session associated with the user to be terminated by the PDSN. (Col 6 lines 25-61)

As per claim 12, Madour1 discloses the method as recited in claim 3, wherein the disconnect request message is triggered by a second access request message sent to the second AAA server by a second PDSN to which the node has roamed. (Col 1 lines 31-61)

As per claim 13, Madour1 discloses the method as recited in claim 12, wherein the disconnect request message is sent after an access accept message is sent by the second AAA server to the first AAA server. (Col 1 lines 31-61)

As per claim 14, Madour1 discloses the method as recited in claim 12, wherein the access request message and the second access request message each comprise a RADIUS access request message including a username identifier identifying a user associated with the Mobile IP session, a session identifier identifying a session associated with the user, and a PDSN identifier identifying the PDSN. (Col 1 line 60 – Col 2 line 9)

As per claims 15, 29, and 39, Madour1 discloses the method as recited in claim 1, further comprising: sending a disconnect acknowledgement message indicating that the PDSN has successfully disconnected the user. (Col 6 line 62 – Col 7 line 12; Figure 5: item 536)

As per claim 16, Madour1 discloses The method as recited in claim 15, wherein the disconnect acknowledgement message is sent to the first AAA server. (Col 6 line 62 – Col 7 line 12; Figure 5: item 536, happens after Figure 5: item 534)

As per claims 21 -22, 31-32, and 45-48, please see the discussion under claim 1 as similar logic applies.

As per claims 24 and 34, Madour1 discloses the method as recited in claim 23, wherein the node is a mobile node. (Col 4 lines 5-16)

As per claims 25 and 35, Madour1 discloses the method as recited in claim 21, wherein the disconnect request message requests that the first PDSN disconnect the user for the session identified by the session identifier. (Col 6 lines 25-61)

As per claim 26, Madour1 discloses the method as recited in claim 21, wherein the AAA server is a home AAA server associated with a home network of the user. (Col 1 lines 31-61)

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 17, 30, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madour1 (US 6,970,693) / Madour 2 (US 2002/0021681) / Grabelsky (US 2004/0003046) further in view of Shaked et al. – hereinafter Shaked (US 2002/0007411).

As per claims 17, 30, and 40, Madour1/ Madour 2 / Grabelsky discloses the method as recited in claim 3. Madour1 fails to disclose sending a disconnect acknowledgement message to the second AAA server, the disconnect acknowledgement message indicating that the PDSN has successfully disconnected the user. Shaked discloses sending a disconnect acknowledgement message to the second AAA server, the disconnect acknowledgement message indicating that the PDSN has successfully disconnected the user. ([0091]-[0092]) In reference to KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. -, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007), it would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine prior art elements to implement messages to indicating the PDSN has successfully disconnected the user in the PDSN of Madour1 to provide notification of disconnect and connect events in response to the actions performed by PDSN of

Madour1 in the context of (Col 3 line 63 – Col 4 line 4) “with a Session Termination Capability (STC) parameter indicative of the ability of the serving PDSN to disconnect data sessions based on a request provided by a remote authorized node, such as a Home Agent (HA) or the HAAA/PPS.”

Claims 18-20, and 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madour1 (US 6,970,693) / Madour 2 (US 2002/0021681) / Grabelsky (US 2004/0003046) further in view of Moller et al. – hereinafter Moller (US 2003/0028598)

As per claims 18, 20, and 41, Madour1/ Madour 2 / Grabelsky discloses the method as recited in claim 1. Madour1 fails to disclose sending a disconnect non-acknowledgement message indicating that the PDSN is unable to disconnect the user. Moller discloses sending a disconnect non-acknowledgement message indicating that the PDSN is unable to disconnect the user. ([0090]-[0091]) In reference to KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. -, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007), it would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine prior art elements to implement messages to indicating the PDSN has unsuccessfully disconnected the user in the PDSN of Madour1 to provide an error codes in response to the actions performed by PDSN of Madour1 in the context of (Col 3 line 63 – Col 4 line 4) “with a Session Termination Capability (STC) parameter indicative of the ability of the serving PDSN to disconnect data sessions based on a request provided by a remote authorized node, such as a Home Agent (HA) or the HAAA/PPS.”

As per claim 19, Madour1/ Madour 2 / Grabelsky / Moller disclose the method of claim 18. Madour1 fails to disclose non-acknowledgement message is sent to the first AAA server. Moller1 discloses sending a non-acknowledgement message ([0090]. In reference to KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. -, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007), it would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine prior art elements to implement messages to indicating the PDSN has unsuccessfully disconnected the user in the PDSN of Madour1 to provide an error codes in response to the actions performed by PDSN of Madour1 in the context of (Col 3 line 63 – Col 4 line 4) “with a Session Termination Capability (STC) parameter indicative of the ability of the serving PDSN to disconnect data sessions based on a request provided by a remote authorized node, such as a Home Agent (HA) or the HAAA/PPS.”

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chirag R Patel whose telephone number is (571)272-7966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pairdirect.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

/C. R. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2141

/Jason D Cardone/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145